

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/126,884	07/31/1998	MICHAEL C. BERTRAM	533/133	9408
26291	7590 11/09/2004		EXAM	INER
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN L.L.P.			NGUYEN, BRIAN D	
	595 SHREWSBURY AVE, STE 100 FIRST FLOOR SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702			PAPER NUMBER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/126,884	BERTRAM ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
	•		2661		
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	Brian D Nguyen pears on the cover sheet with the			
Period fo					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period treeto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro e, cause the application to become ABANDOI	timely filed lays will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on the	amendment filed 8/4/04.			
·		s action is non-final.			
3)	, <u> </u>				
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
1/63	 ✓ Claim(s) 1-3,5-10 and 12-26 is/are pending in the application. ✓ 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 				
5)□	i) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-10 and 12-26</u> is/are rejected.				
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
,—	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	ce Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica prity documents have been recei	ation No		
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies not recei	ved.		
Attachmen	t(s)				
	ee of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summa			
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa	Date I Patent Application (PTO-152)		
	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	# (*		

Application/Control Number: 09/126,884

Art Unit: 2661

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slattery (6,246,701) in view of Gardner et al (6,327,275).

Regarding claim 1, Slattery discloses a method for processing a transport stream (TS1, TS2, TS3) comprising a plurality of time slots for transporting therein respective programs having a common time base indicated by periodically inserted time stamps comprising modifying packets associated with a desired time slot of a received transport stream to produce an output transport stream and transmitting the output transport stream, wherein the transmitted output transport stream includes respective modified programs having the common time base indicated by the periodically inserted time stamps provided by the received transport stream (see abstract; Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 12-14; col. 5, lines 48-50 & 62-65; col. 6, lines 11-16; col. 9, lines 26-30; col. 9, line 47-col. 10, line 7; col. 10, lines 27-44; and col. 40, lines 28-30). Slattery does not specifically disclose the modified packet uses a matching time stamp of the received transport stream. However, Gardner discloses the modified packet uses a matching time stamp of the received transport stream (see col. 1, lines 7-14; col. 4, lines 30-59; and col. 5, lines 5-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to a use a matching time stamp of the received transport stream as taught by

Gardner in the system of Slattery with the motivation being to maintain the timing of the packets in the received transport stream.

Regarding claims 2-3 and 5-6, Slattery further discloses examining and replacing NULL packets/programs with replacement packets/programs by inserting the replacement packets/programs into an output transport stream (see abstract; Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 12-14; col. 5, lines 48-50; col. 9, line 47-col. 10, line 7; col. 10, lines 27-44; and col. 40, lines 28-30).

Regarding claims 7-10 and 26, Slattery discloses an apparatus for processing a received transport stream comprising N time slots for transporting therein N respective programs having a common time base indicated by periodically inserted time stamps comprising a transport clock source; N transport encoders; a multiplexer for receiving and modifying packets associated with a desired time slot of one or more transport encoded program streams. The multiplexer producing a processed transport stream, wherein the processed transport stream includes respective modified programs having the common time base indicated by the periodically inserted time stamps provided by the received transport stream and a file server coupled between the multiplexer and the N transport encoders (see abstract; Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 12-14; col. 5, lines 48-50; col. 9, lines 26-30; col. 9, line 47-col. 10, line 7; col. 10, lines 27-44; col. 29, line 41-col. 30, line 7; and col. 40, lines 28-30). Slattery implicitly discloses a frequency divider to divide a timing signal CLK from the transport clock source into N timing signals so as the bit rate of the slotted transport stream will be equal to the sum of the bit rates of the N slots. Slattery does not specifically disclose the modified packet uses a matching time stamp of the received transport stream. However, Gardner discloses the modified packet uses a matching time stamp of the received transport stream (see col. 1, lines 7-14; col. 4, lines 30-59; and col. 5, lines 5-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to a use a matching time stamp of the received transport stream as taught by Gardner in the system of Slattery with the motivation being to maintain the timing of the packets in the received transport stream.

Regarding claim 12, Slattery discloses an apparatus for processing a received transport stream comprising a plurality of time slots for transporting therein a respective plurality of programs having a common time base indicated by periodically inserted time stamps comprising a transport clock source, a plurality of encoder for receiving and encoding program streams to produce a respective encoded program stream, each of the encoded program streams being coupled to a switch via a respective buffer memory, the switch selectively coupling program stream transport packets from the buffer memories for modifying packets associated with a desired time slot to produce a slotted transport stream, wherein the slotted transport stream includes respective modified programs having the common time base indicated by the periodically inserted time stamps provided by the received transport stream (see abstract; Fig. 1; col. 3, lines 12-14; col. 5, lines 48-50; col. 9, lines 26-30; col. 9, line 47-col. 10, line 7; col. 10, lines 27-44; col. 29, line 41-col. 30, line 7; and col. 40, lines 28-30). Slattery implicitly discloses a frequency divider to divide a timing signal CLK from the transport clock source into N timing signals so as the bit rate of the slotted transport stream will be equal to the sum of the bit rates of the N slots. Slattery does not specifically disclose the modified packet uses a matching time stamp of the received transport stream. However, Gardner discloses the modified packet uses a matching time stamp of the received transport stream (see col. 1, lines 7-14; col. 4, lines 30-59; and col. 5, lines 5-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to a use a matching time stamp of the received transport stream as taught by Gardner in the system of Slattery with the motivation being to maintain the timing of the packets in the received transport stream.

Regarding claims 13, 16-17, and 21-22, Slattery further discloses a file server (40) for storing encoded program streams and selectively providing at least one encoded program stream to the switch (see Figure 1).

Regarding claims 14-15, 18-20, and 23-25, Slattery further discloses NULL transport packets, adding and deleting NULL transport packets and program packets (see elements 50 & 60 of Figure 1; col. 4, lines 62-67; col. 5, lines 48-50; and col. 10, lines 32-40).

Response to Arguments

'3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/4/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argued that neither references teach or suggest "said slotted transport stream including respective modified programs having said common time base indicated by said periodically inserted time stamp provided by said received transport stream, wherein a modified packet uses matching time stamp of said received transport stream." This argument is not persuasive because Slattery does teach a modified packet uses matching time stamp. In col. 3, lines 22-42, Slattery teaches that time stamps of the system time clock, called program clock reference or "PCRs" are inserted into the payloads of selected transport packets". See common time base in col. 2, line 9-11. See col. 5, lines 48-49 where Slattery teaches insert null packet into the transport packet time slot to maintain the bit rate. See col. 40, lines 31-33 where Slattery

teaches replacing null packets with other to-be-remultiplexed transport packet data. Although Slattery discloses a common time base for synchronization, Slattery does not explicitly show the relative position of packets. Gardner discloses the time stamp (PCR) in col. 1, lines 49-57 and in col. 4, lines 30-48, Gardner shows the relative position of packets, for example packet "B" in lines 34-35 are replaced by null packet "- -". Therefore, both references discuss of matching time stamp. In addition, the application does not use the term **matching** time stamp, the only "time stamp" found in the application is in page 6, line 28.

Conclusion

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian D Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3084. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-6:00 Monday-Thursday.

Application/Control Number: 09/126,884

Art Unit: 2661

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Vanderpuye can be reached on (571) 272-3078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

11/03/04

BRIAN NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER